



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/485,298 02/08/00 YAMAMOTO

J 1422-411P

002292 HM12/1003
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

CHAKRABARTI, A
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1655
DATE MAILED:

10/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/485,298

Applicant(s)

Yamamoto et al.

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit

1655



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 24, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 14 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claims 20, 23 and 27 have been amended and new claims 38-39 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 20-25, 27-29 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Dower et al. (U.S. Patent 5,639,603) (June 17, 1997) in view of Hong et al. (U.S. Patent 6,165, 765) (December 26, 2000).

Art Unit: 1655

Dower et al teach a method for amplifying a DNA by polymerase chain reaction by the use of a DNA fragment comprising a nucleotide analog as a template (Column 27, lines 3-30).

Dower et al teach a method for amplifying a DNA characterized in that the DNA fragment is a cDNA prepared by reverse transcription reaction using an RNA as a template (Column 35, lines 40-64).

Dower et al do not teach the method for amplifying a DNA in the presence of two or more kinds of nucleotide analogs, wherein the nucleotide analogs are uniformly incorporated into the resulting DNA, thereby selectively amplifying DNA of a target sequence.

Hong et al teach the method for amplifying a DNA in the presence of two or more kinds of nucleotide analogs, wherein the nucleotide analogs are uniformly incorporated into the resulting DNA, thereby selectively amplifying DNA of a target sequence (Column 3, lines 10-20 and Claims 1 and 6).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute and combine the method for amplifying a DNA in the presence of two or more kinds of nucleotide analogs, wherein the nucleotide analogs are uniformly incorporated into the resulting DNA, thereby selectively amplifying DNA of a target sequence of Hong et al with the methods of amplifying nucleic acids using modified nucleotide template of Dower et al ., since Hong et al state, "In the past few years since this enzyme was made commercially available under the name of Bst DNA polymerase, independent reports have confirmed that during sequencing reaction catalyzed by this enzyme all four dNTPs, including

Art Unit: 1655

dCTP, and other nucleotide analogs, such as dITP and 7-deazadGTP, are incorporated equally effectively in the chain elongation, thus eliminating the weak "C" band phenomena often observed when other DNA polymerases are used, and producing a very good band uniformity on the sequencing gel (Column 3, lines 10-20)". An ordinary artisan would have been motivated by these express statements of Hong et al to substitute and combine the method for amplifying a DNA in the presence of two or more kinds of nucleotide analogs, wherein the nucleotide analogs are uniformly incorporated into the resulting DNA, thereby selectively amplifying DNA of a target sequence of Hong et al with the methods of amplifying nucleic acids using modified nucleotide template of Dower et al ., in order to achieve the express advantages of modified nucleotide analogues, as noted by Hong et al , which provides a method that confirmed that during sequencing reaction catalyzed by a particular polymerase enzyme all four dNTPs, including dCTP, and other nucleotide analogs, such as dITP and 7-deazadGTP, are incorporated equally effectively in the chain elongation, thus eliminating the weak "C" band phenomena often observed when other DNA polymerases are used, and producing a very good band uniformity on the sequencing gel.

4. Claims 20-30 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Dower et al. (U.S. Patent 5,639,603) (June 17, 1997) in view of Hong et al. (U.S. Patent 6,165, 765) (December 26, 2000). further in view of Dodge et al. (U.S. Patent 5,912,117) (June 15, 1999).

Dower et al in view of Hong et al teach the method of claims 20-25, 27-29 and 38-39 as described above.

Art Unit: 1655

Dower et al in view of Hong et al do not teach the compounds for lowering the T_m value of a double-stranded nucleic acid.

Dodge et al teach the compounds (glycerol and DMSO) for lowering the T_m value of a double-stranded nucleic acid.(Column 8, line 49 to column 9, line 4).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute and combine the compounds for lowering T_m of duplex DNA of Dodge et al with the fast and accurate methods of amplifying nucleic acids using modified nucleotide template and nucleotides of Dower et al in view of Hong et al., since Dodge et al state, "To assure PCR efficiency, glycerol and other related solvents such as dimethyl sulfoxide, can be used to increase the sensitivity of the PCR at the amplification level and to overcome problems pertaining to the sequencing of regions of DNA having strong secondary structure. These problems may include : (1) low efficiency of the PCR, due to a high frequency of templates that are not fully extended by the polymerizing agent or (2) incomplete denaturation of the duplex DNA at high temperatures, due to high GC content. The use of such solvents increases the sensitivity of the assay at the level of amplification to approximately several femtograms of DNA (which is believed to correspond to a single spirochete cell). This level of sensitivity eliminates the need to detect amplified target DNA using a probe, and thereby dispenses with the requirements for radioactive probes, gel electrophoresis, Southern blotting, filter hybridization, washing and autoradiography (Column 8, line 49 to column 9, line 2)". An ordinary artisan would have been motivated by these express statements of Dodge et al to

Art Unit: 1655

substitute and combine the compounds for lowering T_m of duplex DNA of Dodge et al with the fast and accurate methods of amplifying nucleic acids using modified nucleotide template and nucleotides of Dower et al in view of Hong et al., in order to achieve the express advantages of solvents, as noted by Dodge et al , which provides assurance of PCR efficiency and increases the sensitivity of the PCR at the amplification level to overcome problems pertaining to the sequencing of regions of DNA having strong secondary structure including : (1) low efficiency of the PCR, due to a high frequency of templates that are not fully extended by the polymerizing agent or (2) incomplete denaturation of the duplex DNA at high temperatures, due to high GC content and in addition, increases the sensitivity of the assay at the level of amplification to approximately several femtograms of DNA (which is believed to correspond to a single spirochete cell) which eliminates the need to detect amplified target DNA using a probe, and thereby dispenses with the requirements for radioactive probes, gel electrophoresis, Southern blotting, filter hybridization, washing and autoradiography.

5. Claims 20-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Dower et al. (U.S. Patent 5,639,603) (June 17, 1997) in view of Hong et al. (U.S. Patent 6,165, 765) (December 26, 2000) further in view of Dodge et al. (U.S. Patent 5,912,117) (June 15, 1999) further in view of Stratagene Catalog (1988, Page 39).

Dower et al. in view of Hong et al. further in view of Dodge et al. expressly teach the method claims of 20-30 and 38-39 including all the modified nucleotide templates, analogues

Art Unit: 1655

and compounds for lowering the T_m value of a double-stranded nucleic acid as described above in detail.

Dower et al. in view of Hong et al. further in view of Dodge et al do not teach the motivation to combine all the reagents for amplifying a nucleic acid in the form of a kit.

Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation to combine reagents into kit format (page 39).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a suitable container and all the modified nucleotide templates, analogues and compounds for lowering the T_m value of a double-stranded nucleic acid as taught by Dower et al. in view of Hong et al. further in view of Dodge et al, into a kit format as discussed by Stratagene catalog since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in an assay into a kit, "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different reagents have been assembled and pre-mixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not purchase gram quantities of 10 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2) The other service provided in a kit is quality control". (page 39, column 1).

Art Unit: 1655

Response to Amendment

6. In response to amendment, all previous 103(a) rejections have been replaced by new 103(a) rejections.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7401.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Arun Chakrabarti,
Patent Examiner,
October 1, 2001


W. Gary Jones
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

10/1/01